Special CRISP Team teleconference held on Monday, May 18th 2015 (13:00 UTC)

Discussion of the CWG proposal response

**CRISP members present:**

**AFRINIC**

Janvier Ngnoulayea

**APNIC**

Izumi Okutani, IO

**ARIN**

Michael Abejuala, MA

John Sweeting, JS

**LACNIC**

**RIPE NCC**

Andrei Robachevsky

Nurani Nimpuno, NN

Germán Valdez, GV - NRO Executive Secretary

Laureana Pavon, LP - Scribe

----

Meeting began at 13.03 UTC

Draft agenda:

1) Response to the names proposal

2) Responses provided to GAO

3) Update on the meeting IO and NN had with the CWG chairs and meeting with the NRO EC during the RIPE week

----

**1) Response to the names proposal**

IO gave general update on the draft response she had shared on the mailing list.

1.- ICANN subcontracting PTI as the IANA functions operator

2.- Role of the PTI Board

3.- and 4.- Related to CSC and the numbers review team

5.- IPR

It was noted that comments had been received on the mailing list and no conflicts had been observed, simply improvements and suggestions.

Objectives: 1) Restate our positions. 2) Clarify some of the issues. The preamble should state that we are not interested in modifying the CRISP proposal. This is important not so much for the CWG but for the numbers community.

Way forward: MA will take the pen (until 16:00 UTC), then the team will have two hours to submit feedback/final comments (until 18:00 UTC). Submission to names CWG will be at 20:00 UTC.

**2) Responses provided to GAO**

IO has already submitted the response and shared it on the global IANA XFER list. Two additional, specific questions have been received from the GAO:

1.- The role of the ASO

2.- How easy or difficult it is for the RIRs to terminate or not chose to continue with the existing operator

IO described how she and NN had drafted their responses to these additional questions and asked for comments. No comments were heard. IO thanked everyone who had submitted feedback on the mailing list.

**3) Update on the meeting IO and NN had with the CWG chairs and meeting with the NRO EC during the RIPE week**

IO provided an update on the second meeting IO and NN had had with the CWG chairs (the week before).

Next step on IPR: We feel this is something the three operational communities need to discuss the way forward. We suggested having another call to discuss IPR issues and invite the IETF to participate.

NN: We were clear that this wasn’t input from the numbers community but our attempt to analyze any overlaps. We said we were going to share our comments through the official channels as well.

Meeting with the NRO EC: IO provided an update: Among other things, she said they had discussed how the numbers community would decide the termination of the SLA.

Action: Secretariat to post response to the GAO to the NRO website, along with the extra questions received regarding the termination of the SLA.

Another topic discussed with the NRO EC: The role the CRISP team will be taking and the role the RIRs will be taking as regards the SLA text.

RIR staff will prepare a table of the feedback received on the global numbers mailing list and write observations on how this will be reflected in the SLA. It would be helpful if RIR staff from the CRISP team could help us with this. We need to clarify to the global community that they’re not getting ignored but that their comments are being compiled. We need to send a message this week that this is what we plan to do.

Next steps: Prepare a draft message stating how we plan to communicate on the IANA XFER list, sharing it first on the CRISP list.

Action: MA volunteered to coordinate with RIR staff members to start drafting the message stating how the feedback received on the global numbers mailing list will be handled.

NN: One of the issues we identified in the meeting with the NRO EC is the need for better coordination and communication. We may want to be clearer in explaining the workings of our community and what the CRISP principles are. Maybe we can think jointly about how we can do this.

IO: We’ve requested a dedicated meeting with the NRO EC (CRISP TEAM + NRO EC), but we haven’t discussed in detail the role of the CRISP team and the NRO EC will be.

Action: NRO Secretariat to coordinate the schedule for a CRISP team meeting with the NRO EC.

IO: Final point from the meeting with the EC: we as CRISP team are expected to comment on the SLA, especially in comparison with the numbers proposal.

IO asked for volunteers to analyze what is described in the SLA from the numbers proposal and see if there’s anything that is not clear enough or needs to be added. It was decided to call for volunteers on the CRISP mailing list – two individual volunteers (one from the legal team, the other not).

MA said he’d be happy to volunteer if no one else was available.

Next meeting: To be confirmed on the CRISP mailing list.

Meeting closed at 13:56 UTC.